



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/738,362	12/17/2003	Alik Teplitsky	MS1-1871US	8559
22801	7590	08/18/2008		
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201				
EXAMINER				
PHAM, MICHAEL				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2167				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/18/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/738,362

Applicant(s)

TEPLITSKY ET AL.

Examiner

MICHAEL PHAM

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18-22, 24-26, 28, 29, 32-34 and 37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) -8, 11-12, 14-15, 18-22, 24-26, 28-29, 32-34, and 37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Status

1. Claims 1-8, 11-12, 14-15, 18, 19-22, 24, 25-26, 28-29, 32-34, and 37 are pending.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 14 appears to depend to itself. However, it appears to be a typo that was meant to be dependent to claim 12. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 19-22, 24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

MPEP 2106:

The claims lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best functional descriptive material per se.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material". Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material per se, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the

descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994)

Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e. abstract ideas, stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because "[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer"

In particular, claim 19 recites "a system". However, claim 19 fails to contain any computer hardware that is used to implement the system so as to realize its functionality. Thus, the body of claim 19 is merely an abstract idea and is being processed without any links to a practical result in the technology arts and without any computer hardware manipulation. Contrary to arguments made by some applicants use of the word system does not inherently mean that the claim is directed to a machine. Only if at least one of the claimed elements of the system is a physical part of a device can the system as claimed constitute part of a device or a combination of devices to be a machine within the meaning of 101. Claim 19 further recites "a link translation table" and "a translation module" all of which may be reasonably interpreted as software routines. Applicant's provide further evidence of this on and page 12 lines 4-15. All other claims fail to resolve the deficiencies of claim 19 and are therefore rejected.

6. Claims 25-26, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Interim Guidelines for examination of Patent Applications for Patent subject matter eligibility states, page 51:

When nonfunctional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, in a computer or an electromagnetic carrier signal, it is not statutory since no requisite functionality is present to satisfy the practical application requirement. Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive language material, i.e. abstract ideas, stored in a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPq at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because "[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer."). Such a result would exalt form over substance. In re *Sarkar*, 588 F.2d 1330, 200 USPQ 132, 137 (CCPA 1978) ("[E]ach invention must be evaluated as claimed; yet semantogenic considerations preclude a determination based solely on words appearing in the claims. In the final analysis under 101, the claimed invention as a whole must be evaluated for what it is") (quoted with approval in *Abele*, 684 F.2d at 907, 214 USPQ at 687). See also in re *Johnson*, 589 F.2d 1070, 1077, 200 USPQ 199, 206 (CCPA 1978) ("form of the claim is often an exercise in drafting"). Thus, nonstatutory music is not a computer component and it does not become statutory by merely recording it on a compact disk. Protection for this type of work is provided under the copyright law.

In particular claim 25 recites "computer-readable media". The claims fail to place the invention squarely within one statutory class of invention. Applicant provides evidence on page 24 lines 21-25 that applicant intends the computer-readable media to include communications media. As such, the claim is drawn to a form of energy. Energy is not one of the four categories of invention and therefore this claim(s) is/are not statutory. Energy is not a series of steps or acts and thus is not a process. Energy is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Energy is not a combination of substances and is therefor not a composition of matter. All other claims fail to resolve the deficiencies of claim 25 and are therefore rejected.

7. Claims 29 and 32-37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Art Unit: 2167

MPEP 2106:

The claims lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best functional descriptive material per se.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material". Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material per se, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994)

Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e. abstract ideas, stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because "[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer"

In particular, claim 29 recites "an apparatus". However, claim 29 fails to contain any computer hardware that is used to implement the apparatus so as to realize its functionality. Thus, the body of claim 29 is merely an abstract idea and is being processed without any links to a practical result in the technology arts and without any computer hardware manipulation. Contrary to arguments made by some applicants use of the word apparatus does not inherently mean that the claim is directed to a machine. Only if at least one of the claimed elements of the system is a physical part of a device can the system as claimed constitute part of a device or a combination of devices to be a machine within the meaning of 101. All other claims fail to resolve the deficiencies of claim 29 and are therefore rejected.

Art Unit: 2167

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claims 1-3, 7-8, 11, 12, 14, 18, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6732105 Watson et. al. (hereafter Watson) further in view of US 5937404 by Csaszar et. al. (hereafter Csaszar).**

Claim 1:

Watson discloses

“receiving a request for an internal web page from an external browser application;” [figure 5 element 502, a browser. Col. 1 lines 10-15, a wireless electronic device to connect with authenticated access to intranet web applications. Accordingly, receiving a request (wireless electronic device to connect with) for an internal web page (intranet web application) from an external browser application (browser)]

“identifying link information contained in the request for the internal web page;”[col. 9 lines 5-7 discloses, the query (containing link), is translated from wireless communications protocol (and encryption) to IP protocol (and encryption) in the second step. Col. 9 lines 15-18 discloses, examine the query to see if it contains a link having a recognized keyword. Keywords are used to determine if a link targets the intranet or the internet. Accordingly, identifying link information (keyword) contained in the request (query) for the internal web page (intranet).]

”storing the link information which has been identified in a link translation table;”[col. 9 lines 19-23 discloses, checking if the query includes a link having a recognized keyword and the corresponding file path to the server on the Intranet. Accordingly, storing the link information (recognized keyword) which has been identified in a link translation table (keyword table).]

“identifying at least one internal link in the internal web page;”[col. 9 lines 22-23 discloses, the appropriate keyword and the corresponding file path to the server to the Intranet. Accordingly, identifying (corresponding) at least one internal link in the internal web page (file path to the server to the Intranet).]

“modifying the at least one internal link based on the link information stored in the link translation table, such that the internal link is accessible by the external browser application;”[col. 9 lines 27-34, once a query containing a recognized keyword is routed to the Intranet, Keyword look up table obtains the corresponding file path of the URL to the recognized keyword in the keyword look up table. The link can now be rewritten with the corresponding top level path way to the correct application and web server on the Intranet. Once the link has been rewritten, the query is routed to the appropriate intranet web server and application. Accordingly, modifying the at least one internal link (link can now be rewritten) based on the link information stored in the link translation table (recognized keyword in the keyword look up table), such that the internal link is accessible (query is routed to the appropriate intranet web server and application) by the external browser application (figure 5 element 502).]

“communicating the requested web page, including the modified internal link, to the external browser application, and”[figure 5 element 502, a browser. Col. 3 lines 2-5, permits portable wireless devices secure and authenticated access to applications that are on an Intranet Server. Col. 3 lines 17-19, wireless device securely communicates with an Intranet by verifying authentication parameters to provide network level authentication. Col. 1 lines 10-15, a wireless device to connect with authenticated access to intranet web applications. Col. 9 lines 59-60, when user of the wireless device clicks on a rewritten link containing a recognizable keyword. Accordingly, communicating the requested web page (web application), including the modified internal link (rewritten link containing a recognized keyword), to the external browser application (browser).]

Watson does not disclose

“deleting the identified link information from the link translation table after communicating the requested web page. to the external browser application whereby, making the link information inaccessible after fulfilling the request.” alone.

On the other hand, Csaszar discloses col. 3 lines 16-25, links that are not in the approved list are removed from the requested database by the link modifying and deactivating module in the dedicated server. The removal process strips the element from its linking qualities by removing a portion of the code defining the link and renders the non-approved links inactive. Table 1 and Table 3. Col. 4 lines 60-62, Table 1 is a hypertext markup language description of the example shown in figure 3. Col. 5 lines

Art Unit: 2167

50-51, The coded tags <a href...> and defining the text database3 as an active link have been removed 62.

Accordingly disclosing deleting the identified link information (Database3) from the link translation table (Table 1, html) after communicating the requested web page (Table 1, html) to the external browser application (dedicated server) whereby, making the link information inaccessible after fulfilling the request (coded tags <a href...> and defining the text database3 as an active link have been removed 62).

Both Watson and Csaszar disclose a link modification system. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art to have applied Csaszar's disclosure above to the system of Watson for the purpose of deactivating and removing links that are improper or unapproved.

Claim 2:

The combination of Watson and Csazar disclose disclose in Watson "wherein modifying the at least one internal link includes modifying a portion of a uniform resource locator associated with the at least one internal link." [col. 9 lines 59-60, when user of the wireless device clicks on a rewritten link (modified link) containing a recognized keyword, the proxy server decides where to target the link by using the keyword lookup table to find the pathway that corresponds to the recognizable keyword. col. 8 lines 48-50, the rewritten link includes a keyword that designates the application and the Intranet

Art Unit: 2167

server that hosts the application (modifies a portion of a url associated with the internal link)]

Claim 3:

The combination of Watson and Csazar disclose in Watson “wherein modifying the at least one internal link includes modifying a protocol associated with the at least one internal link.” [col. 3 lines 46-47, translating (modify) between wireless communication protocol and IP communication protocol]

Claim 6:

The combination of Watson and Csazar disclose in Watson “wherein the request for an internal web page is received via the Internet.” [col. 2 lines 58-60, wireless devices are able to access servers through Internet gateways]

Claim 7:

The combination of Watson and Csazar disclose in Watson “wherein the internal web page is stored on a server coupled to an internal network.” [figure 5 element 508, 510, intranet with private servers with applications (web applications)]

Claim 8:

The combination of Watson and Csazar disclose in Watson “wherein modifying the at least one internal link includes accessing string mappings from a link translation table and applying the string mappings to the at least one internal link,” [col. 9 lines 19-35,

Art Unit: 2167

recognized keywords are stored in keyword look up table that contains the appropriate keyword and the corresponding file path to the server]

Claim 11:

The combination of Watson and Csazar disclose in Watson “One or more computer-readable memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in claim 1.”[col. 1 – col. 3, computer systems]

Claim 12:

Watson discloses the following claimed limitations:

“receiving a request for an internal web page from an external source,” [figure 5 element 502, a browser. Col. 1 lines 10-15, a wireless electronic device to connect with authenticated access to the Intranet web applications. Accordingly, receiving a request (wireless electronic device to connect with) for an internal web page (Intranet web application) from an external source (browser)]

“wherein the request for an internal web page is received via a public network and wherein the internal web page is stored on a server coupled to a private network;”[figure 2 and figure 5. Accordingly, wherein the request for an internal web page is received (wireless electronic device to connect with) via a public network (telephone network) and wherein the internal web page is stored on a server coupled to a private network (intranet)]

“identifying link information contained in the request for an internal web page;”[col. 9 lines 5-7 discloses the query (containing link), is translated from wireless communications protocol (and encryption) to IP protocol (and encryption) in the second

step. Col. 9 lines 15-18 discloses, examine the query to see if it contains a link having a recognized keyword. Keywords are used to determine if a link targets the Intranet or the Internet. Accordingly, identifying link information (keyword) contained in the request (query) for an internal web page (Intranet)]

“storing the identified link information in a link translation table;”[col. 9 lines 19-23 disclose checking if the query includes a link having a recognized keyword. Recognized keywords are stored in keyword look up table that contains the appropriate keyword and the corresponding file path to the server on the Intranet. Accordingly, storing the identified link information (recognized keyword) in a link translation table (keyword look up table)]

“retrieving the internal web page;”[col. 1 lines 10-15, a wireless electronic device to connect (requesting device) with authenticated access to intranet web applications (internal web pages)]

“translating any internal links in the internal web page such that the internal links are accessible by the external source, “[col. 9 lines 27-34, once a query containing a recognized keyword is routed to the Intranet, Keyword look up table obtains the corresponding file path of the URL to the recognized keyword in the keyword look up table. The link can now be rewritten with the corresponding top level pathway to the correct application and web server on the Intranet. Once the link has been rewritten, the query is routed to the appropriate intranet web server and application. Accordingly, translating any internal links in the internal web page (link can now be rewritten) such that the internal links are accessible (query is routed to the appropriate Intranet web application) by the external source (figure 5 element 502).]

“wherein translating comprises accessing data in the link translation table; and”[col. 9 lines 46-47, uses the keyword table to rewrite the link to specify a particular keyword corresponding to the correct application and server on the Intranet. Accordingly, wherein translating comprises accessing data in the link translation table (uses the keyword table to rewrite).]

“communicating the internal web page, including the translated internal links, to the external source; and”[figure 5 element 502, a browser. Col. 1 lines 2-5 permits portable wireless devices secure and authenticated access to applications that are on an Intranet server. Col. 3 lines 17-19, wireless device securely communicates with an Intranet by verifying authentication parameters to provide network level authentication. Col. 1 lines 10-15, a wireless electronic device to connect with authenticated access to intranet web applications. Col. 9 lines 59-60, when user of the wireless device clicks on a rewritten link containing a recognized keyword, the proxy server decides where to target the link by using the keyword lookup table to find the pathway that corresponds to the recognizable keyword. Accordingly, communicating the internal web page (web application), including the translated internal links (rewritten link containing a recognized keyword), to the external source (browser)]

Watson does not explicitly disclose

“deleting the identified link information from the link translation table after communicating the internal web page to the external source whereby making the link information inaccessible after fulfilling the request.” alone.

On the other hand, Csaszar discloses col. 3 lines 16-25, links that are not in the approved list are removed from the requested database by the link modifying and deactivating module in the dedicated server. The removal process strips the element from its linking qualities by removing a portion of the code defining the link and renders the non-approved links inactive. Table 1 and Table 3. Col. 4 lines 60-62, Table 1 is a hypertext markup language description of the example shown in figure 3. Col. 5 lines 50-51, The coded tags `<a href...>` and `` defining the text database3 as an active link have been removed 62.

Accordingly disclosing deleting the identified link information (`Database3 `) from the link translation table (Table 1, html) after communicating the requested web page (Table 1, html) to the external browser application (dedicated server) whereby, making the link information inaccessible after fulfilling the request (coded tags `<a href...>` and `` defining the text database3 as an active link have been removed 62).

Both Watson and Csaszar disclose a link modification system. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art to have applied Csaszar's disclosure above to the system of Watson for the purpose of deactivating and removing links that are improper or unapproved.

Claim 14:

Art Unit: 2167

The combination of Watson and Csaszar disclose in Watson “wherein the link translation table includes at least one entry defined by a user.” [col. 9 lines 5-7, the query (containing link) is translated from wireless communication protocol to IP protocol in step 702. col. 9 lines 15-17, examine the query to see if it contains a link having a recognized keyword. Col. 9 lines 58-62. Figure 10.]

Claim 18:

The combination of Watson and Csazar disclose in Watson “one or more computer-readable memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in claim 12.”[col. 1 – col. 3, computer systems]

Claim 25:

Watson discloses the following claimed limitations:

“receiving a request for an internal web page via a public network;”[figure 1B, computer connects to internet to access a server, in order to access applications on server a request must be made by logging in.]

“retrieving the requested internal web page;”[Col. 1 lines 10-15, a wireless electronic device to connect (requesting device) with authenticated access to intranet web applications (internal web pages)]

“identifying link information contained in the request for the internal web page;”[col. 9 lines 5-7 discloses, the query (containing link), is translated from wireless communications protocol (and encryption) to IP protocol (and encryption) in second step.

Col. 9 lines 15-18 discloses, examine the query to see if it contains a link having a recognized keyword. Keywords are used to determine if a link targets the Intranet or the Internet. Accordingly, identifying link information (keyword) contained in the request (query) for the internal web page (intranet).]

“storing the link information which has been identified in a link translation table;”[col. 9 lines 19-23 disclose, checking if the query includes a link having a recognized keyword. Recognized keywords are stored in keyword look up table that contains the appropriate keyword and the corresponding file path to the server on the Intranet. Accordingly, storing the link information (recognized keyword) which has been identified in a link translation table (keyword table).]

“determining whether the internal web page contains any internal links;”[Col. 3 lines 32-37, the server system uses a link rewriter service for examining web pages (web page)generated by applications of the intranet to identify links (identifying links)that point to any application that is resident on the intranet (internal)]

“if the internal web page contains at least-one internal link:

modifying the at least one internal link based on the link information stored in the link translation table, such that the internal link is accessible via the public network; and” [col. 9 lines 27-34, once a query containing a recognized keyword is routed to the Intranet, Keyword look up table obtains the corresponding file path of the URL to the recognized keyword in the keyword look up table. The link can now be rewritten with the corresponding top level pathway to the correct application and web server on the Intranet. Once the link has been rewritten, the query is routed to the appropriate intranet web server and

application. Accordingly, modifying the at least one internal link (link can now be rewritten) based on the link information stored in the link translation table (recognized keyword in the keyword look up table), such that the internal link is accessible (query is routed to the appropriate intranet web server and application) via the public network (figure 5 element 502)]

“generating data representing the requested internal web page, wherein the generated data comprises the modified internal link; and”[col. 9 lines 58-65, user clicks on a rewritten link containing keyword (i.e. web page contains modified internal links)]

Watson does not explicitly disclose

“deleting the identified link information from the link translation table after communicating the requested internal web page” alone.

On the other hand, Csaszar discloses col. 3 lines 16-25, links that are not in the approved list are removed from the requested database by the link modifying and deactivating module in the dedicated server. The removal process strips the element from its linking qualities by removing a portion of the code defining the link and renders the non-approved links inactive. Table 1 and Table 3. Col. 4 lines 60-62, Table 1 is a hypertext markup language description of the example shown in figure 3. Col. 5 lines 50-51, The coded tags <a href...> and defining the text database3 as an active link have been removed 62.

Accordingly disclosing deleting (active link have been removed) the identified link information (Database3) from the link translation table (Table 1, html) after communicating the requested web page (Table 1, html).

Both Watson and Csazar disclose a link modification system. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art to have applied Csazar's disclosure above to the system of Watson for the purpose of deactivating and removing links that are improper or unapproved.

Claim 26:

The combination of Watson and Csazar disclose in Watson "One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 25 wherein the request for an internal web page is received via the Internet from a web browser application." [Watson, col. 2 lines 58-60, wireless devices are able to access servers through Internet gateways. figure 5 element 502, a browser (web browser application)]

10. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6732105 Watson et. al. (hereafter Watson) and US 5937404 by Csazar et. al. (hereafter Csazar) further in view of US 20040111491 by Raja et. al. (hereafter Raja).

Claim 4:

Art Unit: 2167

The combination of Watson and Cszasz do not explicitly disclose “wherein modifying the at least one internal link includes modifying a port associated with the at least one internal link.”

On the other hand, raja, 0051 discloses location.port as an approach used in conjunction with modifications of URLs.

Watson, Cszasz, and Raja are within the same field of endeavor, as they are directed to accessing systems. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied Raja for the purpose of providing more dynamic content. In doing so it may be appreciated that the processing overhead for the proxy server may be reduced.

Claim 5:

The combination of Watson and Cszasz do not explicitly disclose “wherein modifying the at least one internal link includes modifying a server name associated with the at least one internal link.”

On the other hand, Raja, 0051 discloses Location.hostname as an approach used in conjunction with modification of URLs.

Watson, Cszasz, and Raja are within the same field of endeavor, as they are directed to accessing systems. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

Art Unit: 2167

the time the invention was made to have applied Raja for the purpose of providing more dynamic content. In doing so it may be appreciated that the processing overhead for the proxy server may be reduced.

11. Claims 15 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6732105 Watson et. al. (hereafter Watson) and US 5937404 by Cszaszar et. al. (hereafter Cszaszar) further in view of US 6397259 by Lincke et. al. (hereafter Lincke).

Claim 15:

Watson and Cszaszar do not explicitly disclose “wherein identifying link information contained in the request includes identifying data in a header associated with the request.”

On the other hand, Lincke discloses col. 65 lines 29-30, some of the header information included in a typical HTTP request, is used to convey information about the standard browser features to the server such as version numbers and accepted return data types.

Watson, Cszaszar, and Lincke are all directed towards access systems, and are therefore within the same field of endeavor. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied Lincke's disclosure above to the combination of Watson and Cszaszar to properly format the data being returned from the request.

Claim 28:

The combination of Watson and Csaszar do not explicitly disclose “wherein the one or more processors further modify the at least on internal link using information contained in a header associated with the received request for an internal web page.”

On the other hand, Lincke discloses col. 65 lines 29-30, some of the header information included in a typical HTTP request, is used to convey information about the standard browser features to the server such as version numbers and accepted return data types.

Watson, Csaszar, and Lincke are all directed towards access systems, and are therefore within the same field of endeavor. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied Lincke's disclosure above to the combination of Watson and Csaszar to properly format the data being returned from the request.

12. Claims 29 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6732105 Watson et. al. (hereafter Watson) in view of U.S. 5761683 by Logan et. al. (hereafter Logan) and U.S. 5937404 by Csaszar et. al. (hereafter Csaszar).

Claim 29:

Watson discloses the following claimed limitations:

“means for receiving a request for a web page associated with an internal network;”[figure 5 element 502, a browser. Col. 1 lines 10-15, a wireless electronic

device to connect (requesting device) with authenticated access to a intranet web applications (internal web pages)]

“means for identifying link information contained in the request for the web page associated with the internal network;”[col. 9 lines 5-7 discloses, the query (containing link), is translated from wireless communications protocol (and encryption) to IP protocol (and encryption) in the second step. Col. 9 lines 15-18 discloses, examine the query to see if it contains a link having a recognized keyword. Keywords are used to determine if a link targets the Intranet or the Internet. Accordingly, means for identifying link information (keyword) contained in the request (query) for the web page associated with the internal network (intranet).]

“means for storing the link information which is identified in a link translation table, and”[col. 9 lines 19-23 disclose, checking if the query includes a link having a recognized keyword. Recognized keywords are stored in keyword look up table that contains the appropriate keyword and the corresponding file path to the server on the Intranet. Accordingly, means for storing the link information (recognized keyword) which is identified in a link translation table (keyword table).]

“means for translating internal links contained in the web page based on the link information stored in the link translation table,”[col. 9 lines 27-34, once a query containing a recognized keyword is routed to the Intranet, Keyword look up table obtains the corresponding file path of the URL to the recognized keyword in the keyword look up table. The link can now be rewritten with the corresponding top level pathway to the correct application and web server on the Intranet. Accordingly, means for translating internal links contained in the web page (link can now be rewritten) based on the link

information stored in the link translation table (recognized keyword in the keyword look up table)]

“the translating comprising modifying a portion of a uniform resource locator associated with the internal links,”[col. 8 lines 48-50, the rewritten link includes a keyword that designates the application and the Intranet server that hosts the application (modifying a portion of a uniform resource locator associated with the internal links)]

“wherein the internal links are accessible via the internal network, and”[col. 9 lines 27-34, once a query containing a recognized keyword is routed to the Intranet, Keyword look up table obtains the corresponding file path of the URL to the recognized keyword in the keyword look up table. The link can now be rewritten with the corresponding top level pathway to the correct application and web server on the Intranet. Accordingly, wherein the internal links are accessible via the internal network (intranet)]

“wherein the means for translating translates any internal links contained in the web page into external links that are accessible via an external network;”[col. 9 lines 27-34, once a query containing a recognized keyword is routed to the Intranet, Keyword look up table obtains the corresponding file path of the URL to the recognized keyword in the keyword look up table. The link can now be rewritten with the corresponding top level pathway to the correct application and web server on the Intranet. Accordingly, wherein the means for translating translates any internal links contained in the web page into external links that are accessible via an external network (query is routed to the appropriate intranet web server and application)]

“means for communicating web page data, including any translated links, to a source of the request for the web page; and”[figure 5 element 502. Accordingly, means

for communicating web page data (browser), including any translated links to a source of the request for the web page (figure 5 element 201).]

Watson does not explicitly disclose

“wherein the means for storing link translation data contains portions of internal links and corresponding portions of external links.”

On the other hand, Logan discloses col. 4 lines 15-20 and figure 13 element 600, discloses a lookup table which relates local storage URL's to the original remote URL's of the stored document is used to translate URL requests and to update the stored files periodically to match the originating files. In other words, means for communicating web page data, including any translated links, to a source of the request for the web page

Accordingly, wherein the means for storing link translation data (look up table) contains portions of internal links (local url's) and corresponding portions of external links (remote url's) is disclosed.

Both Watson and Logan are directed to remote access systems and are therefore within the same field of endeavor. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Logan's disclosure above to the disclosure of Watson for the purpose of providing updates as to where to retrieve documents [Logan, col. 19 lines 60-67-col. 20 lines 1-3].

However, the combination of Watson and Logan do not explicitly disclose

“means for deleting the link information from the link translation table after communicating the web page data to the source of the request for the web page”.

On the other hand, Csaszar discloses col. 3 lines 16-25, links that are not in the approved list are removed from the requested database by the link modifying and deactivating module in the dedicated server. The removal process strips the element from its linking qualities by removing a portion of the code defining the link and renders the non-approved links inactive. Table 1 and Table 3. Col. 4 lines 60-62, Table 1 is a hypertext markup language description of the example shown in figure 3. Col. 5 lines 50-51, The coded tags `<a href...>` and `` defining the text database3 as an active link have been removed 62.

Accordingly disclosing means for deleting the link information (`Database3 `) from the link translation table (Table 1, html) after communicating the requested web page data to the source of the request for the web page (dedicated server).

Watson, Logan, and Csaszar disclose accessing systems over a network, and are therefore within the same field of endeavor. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art to have applied Csaszar's disclosure above to the combination of Watson and Logan for the purpose of deactivating and removing links that are improper or unapproved.

Claim 32:

The combination of Watson, Logan and Cszasz disclose in Watson "An apparatus as recited in claim 29 wherein the means for translating translates internal links by replacing a first uniform resource Locator associated with the internal links with a second uniform resource Locator associated with external versions of the internal links." [col. 9 lines 59-60, when user of the wireless device clicks on a rewritten link (translated internal link) containing a recognized keyword, the proxy server decides where to target the link by using the keyword lookup table to find the pathway that corresponds to the recognizable keyword. Col. 8 lines 48-50, the rewritten link includes a keyword that designates the application and the Intranet server that hosts the application (modifies a portion of a url associated with the internal link). Modified url is presented to user (translated link)]

Claim 33:

The combination of Watson, Logan and Cszasz disclose in Watson "wherein the means for translating translates internal links by replacing a first protocol designator with a second protocol designator." [col. 3 lines 46-47, translating between wireless communication protocol and IP communication protocol.]

13. Claims 34 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6732105 Watson et. al. (hereafter Watson), U.S. 5761683 by Logan et. al.

Art Unit: 2167

(hereafter Logan), and U.S. 5937404 by Csaszar et. al. (hereafter Csaszar) further in view of US 20040111491 by Raja et. al. (hereafter Raja)

Claim 34:

The combination of Watson, Logan, and Csaszar do not explicitly disclose “wherein the means for translating translates internal links by replacing a first server name associated with the internal links with a second server name associated with external versions of the internal links.”

On the other hand, raja, 0051 discloses location.hostname as an approach used in conjunction with modifications of URLs.

Watson, Csaszar, and Raja are within the same field of endeavor, as they are directed to accessing systems. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied Raja for the purpose of providing more dynamic content. In doing so it may be appreciated that the processing overhead for the proxy server may be reduced.

Claim 37:

The combination of Watson, Logan, Csaszar do not explicitly disclose “wherein the means for storing link translation data contains internal port numbers and corresponding external port numbers.”

Art Unit: 2167

On the other hand, raja, 0051 discloses location.port as an approach used in conjunction with modifications of URLs.

Watson, Csaszar, and Raja are within the same field of endeavor, as they are directed to accessing systems. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied Raja for the purpose of providing more dynamic content. In doing so it may be appreciated that the processing overhead for the proxy server may be reduced.

14. Claims 19-22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6732105 Watson et. al. (hereafter Watson) and US 5937404 by Csaszar et. al. (hereafter Csaszar) further in view of US 5761683 by Logan et. al. (hereafter Logan).

Claim 19:

Watson discloses the following claimed limitations:

“a link translation table, wherein the link translation table stores link information which has been identified in a request for an internal link,”[figure 10 keyword table keyword and file path. Col. 9 lines 5-7 discloses the query containing link), is translated from wireless communication protocol (and encryption) to IP protocol (and encryption) in the second step. Col. 9 lines 15-18 discloses, examines the query to see if it contains a link having a recognized keyword. Keywords are used to determine if a link targets the Intranet or the Internet. Accordingly, wherein the link translation table stores link

information (keyword) which has been identified in a request in a request for an internal link (query)]

“and includes mappings of portions of links between internal links,” [figure 10, file path]

“wherein internal links are accessible by an internal device coupled to an internal network”[figure 5 element 205]

“a translation module coupled to the link translation table,”[col. 9 lines 36-57 and figure 6, link rewriter (i.e. translation module) connected in the same server as the keyword table.]

“wherein the translation module is to receive a request for an internal web page and to identify any internal links in the requested internal web page,”[col. 9 lines 36-57, link rewriting process being when proxy server receives a web page response from an application of the Intranet and the web page is scanned for links. In order to scan must identify.]

“wherein the translation module further modifies any internal links using data contained in the link translation table and generates the requested web page data, including the modified internal links, for communication to a source of the internal web page request.”[col. 9 lines 36-57, uses the keyword table to rewrite the link to specify a particular keyword corresponding to the correct applicaiton and server on the intranet. Once the link has been rewritten, proxy server adds the authentication parameters (further modifies). The query is then routed to the translator server for wireless communicaiton with the electronic device.]

Watson does not explicitly disclose wherein the link translation table includes mappings of portions of links for "external links "wherein" "external links are accessible by an external device coupled to an external network"

On the other hand, Logan, col. 4 lines 15-20 and figure 13 element 600 discloses a lookup table which relates local storage URL's to the original remote URL's of the stored documents is used to translate URL requests and to update the stored files periodically to match the originating files. Accordingly, Logan discloses a link modification table (lookup table) that includes mappings of portions of links between external links (remote url's) and internal links (local storage urls). Further disclosing external links are accessible by an external device coupled to an external network (e.g. remote url).

Watson and Logan are within the same field of endeavor. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Logan's disclosure of external link column from the look up table provided in figure 13 element 600 and col. 4 lines 15-20 to Watson's disclosure in order to provide updates as to where to retrieve documents [logan, col. 19 lines 60-67-col. 20 lines 1-3].

Claim 20:

The combination of Watson and Logan disclose in Watson, "wherein the system is contained in a firewall, wherein the firewall is coupled between a public network and an internal network associated with the internal web page." [col. 1 line 63, firewall.]

Claim 21:

The combination of Watson and Logan disclose in Watson "wherein the system is contained within a web server." [figure 6]

Claim 22:

The combination of Watson and Logan disclose in Logan "a configuration module coupled to the translation module, wherein the configuration module permits editing of data contained in the link translation table [col. 19 lines 61-62, a mechanism for updating stored files which originate from remote locations. Further disclosing col. 20 lines 2-3, taking into account modifications to files]

Claim 24:

The combination of Watson and Logan disclose in Watson "wherein the link translation table contains at least one user-defined entry and at least one entry generated by the translation module in response to the request for an internal web page." [col. 9 lines 5-7, the query (containing link) is translated from wireless communication protocol to IP protocol in step 702. col. 9 lines 15-17, examine the query to see if it contains a link having a recognized keyword. Col. 9 lines 58-62. Figure 10.]

15. Claims 19-22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6732105 Watson et. al. (hereafter Watson) and US 5937404 by Csaszar et. al. (hereafter Csaszar) further in view of US 20030172050 by Decime et. al. (hereafter Decime).

Claim 19:

Watson discloses the following claimed limitations:

“a link translation table, wherein the link translation table stores link information which has been identified in a request for an internal link,”[figure 10 keyword table keyword and file path. Col. 9 lines 5-7 discloses the query containing link), is translated from wireless communication protocol (and encryption) to IP protocol (and encryption) in the second step. Col. 9 lines 15-18 discloses, examines the query to see if it contains a link having a recognized keyword. Keywords are used to determine if a link targets the Intranet or the Internet. Accordingly, wherein the link translation table stores link information (keyword) which has been identified in a request in a request for an internal link (query)]

“and includes mappings of portions of links between internal links,” [figure 10, file path]

“wherein internal links are accessible by an internal device coupled to an internal network”[figure 5 element 205]

“a translation module coupled to the link translation table,”[col. 9 lines 36-57 and figure 6, link rewriter (i.e. translation module) connected in the same server as the keyword table.]

“wherein the translation module is to receive a request for an internal web page and to identify any internal links in the requested internal web page,”[col. 9 lines 36-57, link rewriting process being when proxy server receives a web page response from an application of the Intranet and the web page is scanned for links. In order to scan must identify.]

“wherein the translation module further modifies any internal links using data contained in the link translation table and generates the requested web page data, including the modified internal links, for communication to a source of the internal web page request.”[col. 9 lines 36-57, uses the keyword table to rewrite the link to specify a particular keyword corresponding to the correct applicaiton and server on the intranet. Once the link has been rewritten, proxy server adds the authentication parameters (further modifies). The query is then routed to the translator server for wireless communicaiton with the electronic device.]

Watson does not explicitly disclose wherein the link translation table includes mappings of portions of links for "external links "wherein" "external links are accessible by an external device coupled to an external network"

On the other hand, Decime discloses 0036 external links 188 include network page links such as uniform resource locator address that map to network pages located externally outside of network site 14. Further figure 4 discloses a list of 180 of compiled network page links including internal network links and external network links.

Both inventions are in the same field of endeavor namely network link systems. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to apply Decime's teachings of a list of compiled network page links including internal network links and external network links to Watson's system in order to monitor linked

Art Unit: 2167

content. Thus improving Waton's data access system by monitoring for objectionable content for both internal links and external links.

Claim 20:

The combination of Watson and Decime disclose in Watson, “wherein the system is contained in a firewall, wherein the firewall is coupled between a public network and an internal network associated with the internal web page.” [col. 1 line 63, firewall.]

Claim 21:

The combination of Watson and Decime disclose in Watson “wherein the system is contained within a web server.”[figure 6, web server.]

Claim 22:

The combination of Watson and Decime disclose “a configuration module coupled to the translation module, wherein the configuration module permits editing of data contained in the link translation table.”[0035, producing list corresponds to the result obtained by performing steps 102 and/or 120. 0023, these lists can make it easier to spot the posting of inappropriate links for example content searcher 40 could be used to compare any new link with links on the lists 58, 60 to determine if a content search is warranted.]

Claim 24:

Watson and Decime disclose in Watson “wherein the link translation table contains at least one user-defined entry and at least one entry generated by the translation module in

Art Unit: 2167

response to the request for an internal web page.” [col. 9 lines 5-7, the query (containing link) is translated from wireless communication protocol to IP protocol in step 702. col. 9 lines 15-17, examine the query to see if it contains a link having a recognized keyword. Col. 9 lines 58-62. Figure 10.]

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8, 11-12, 14-15, 18, 19-22, 24, 25-26, 28-29, 32-34, and 37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant's mainly assert the following directed towards the previously cited references.

A. Pages 21-28, Applicant's assert that Watson does not disclose “deleting” of “link information” from a “link translation table” recited in claim 1, 2-8, 11, 12, 14-15, 18, 25, 26, 29, and 32-33.

In response, please see rejection.

B. Pages 29, Watson and Raja does not disclose “deleting” of “link information” from a “link translation table” and therefore claim 4 is not disclosed.

In response, please see rejection.

Art Unit: 2167

C. Page 30, Watson and Raja does not disclose “deleting” of “link information” from a “link translation table” and therefore claim 5, 34, and 37 is not disclosed.

In response, please see rejection.

D. Page 31-32, Watson and Lincke do not disclose “deleting” of “link information” from a “link translation table”. And further applicant’s disagree that user database is the same as an entry defined by user.

In response, this now moot.

E. Page 33, Watson and Raja does not disclose “deleting” of “link information” from a “link translation table” and therefore claim 15 is not disclosed.

In response, please see rejection.

F. Page 34, Watson and Raja does not disclose “deleting” of “link information” from a “link translation table” and therefore claims 28 is not disclosed.

In response, please see rejection.

G. Page 35-36, Applicant’s assert that claim 19 recites “wherein the translation module deletes the modified internal links from the link translation table after communicating the requested web page whereby making the link information inaccessible after fulfilling the request.”

Art Unit: 2167

In response, claim 19 is not necessarily amended in the claims filed 4/3/08. Claim 19 has been amended to remove a term "contains" on line 2 of the claim as seen in the claims filed 4/3/08. The claim does not recite what applicant's state. The rejection is therefore maintained.

H. Page 37-38, Applicant's assert that claim 20 is amended.

In response, based on the claims filed 4/3/08, claim 20 is unamended and original.

I. Page 39, Applicant's assert that Watson does not teach that the system is contained within the web server.

In response the examiner disagrees. Please see figure 6.

J. Pages 39-43, similar arguments were made in regards to claims 19-22 and 24.

In response please see above and rejection.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record listed on PTO-892 and not relied, if any, upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Contact Information

Art Unit: 2167

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PHAM whose telephone number is (571)272-3924. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2167

/John R. Cottingham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
2167

